

amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1487, H.R. 8031.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8031) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "of", to insert "adequately".

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BUSINESS CONFIDENCE MUST BE EARNED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I desire to speak about the extremely important speech made by the President of the United States at Yale University on the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree there on Monday last. I am deeply interested in the domestic economy and what is happening to it, because I am a member of those committees of the Senate which deal with this subject.

The repercussions of the President's commencement address at Yale, the break and continuing slide in the prices of securities on the stock exchanges, and the growing crisis of business confidence in the economy and in the administration, are likely to make the domestic economy the overshadowing issue of the remainder of this session of Congress.

The state of the economy, as the President of the United States recognized, lends credence to the situation, as the economic community senses a pause in the recovery from the recession of 1960. Although employment seems to have improved, there is some discouraging news

on retail sales, personal income, and corporation profits, and we still face the hard nut of endemic, unacceptable unemployment at a rate of 5.4 percent.

This morning we are told that the No. 1 administration priority is tax revision, but this, let us understand, is the legislative action on the tax bill already passed in the House with its highly controversial provisions on withholding tax on dividends and interest, and its provision for income tax credit for new equipment strenuously opposed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, who is in the Chamber now. This is not the antirecession tax cut which has been much discussed and which some members of the President's own party are openly opposing.

The President has asked for business confidence. But has he earned it? The answer is, not yet. The grave danger of current events is that we must have business confidence to avoid a recession, to deal with endemic unemployment, to retool and coordinate U.S. trade and industry, to expand our markets, to deal with our adverse international balance of payments and to give equality of economic opportunity.

Business confidence does not mean the confidence of only management or investors; it also means the confidence of labor and consumers. Confidence in Government does not mean only confidence in the President; it also means confidence in the Congress and in the majority party, which at least presumably will determine the actions both of the administration and the Congress.

Can the President ask for the confidence of business if he does not also propose to win that confidence through asserting an equality of leadership when it comes to labor? Can the President expect the confidence of American business in his leadership of the Nation before he shows his ability to lead his own party?

In short, whatever the President may say about myths and cliches, and however agreeable may be his intellectual speculations, both he and the country are up against the hard proposition that confidence to be received must be earned, that the economic equation demands productivity and markets, and that an economy cannot be gotten to move forward by incantations, intellectual as they may be, any more than it can by cliches and myths.

There are some fundamental challenges in American economic life today, which cannot be glossed over or avoided. Among them is endemic unemployment—to which I have already referred—standing at 3.7 million with nearly 700,000 already out of a job for 6 months or longer. The country apparently has no confidence in the intimation that public works are the way to deal with this problem. The country wants a way to increase economic activity, and the traditional New Deal approach to unemployment is considered to be obsolete. Nor does the country have any confidence in the "made-work" idea, understandable as it is that the trade union leaders should resort to demands for a shorter workweek in the absence of anything more substantial on the horizon.

The problem also is in how to make the transition to greater automation, lower costs, and greater integration of the U.S. economy. Here cooperative action and financing during a transition period are most important. The manpower retraining bill is a welcome first step. There are grave problems, however, presented by our antitrust laws which in some of their operations are now also obsolete; by the absence of coordination in American business adequate to meet the cold war challenge and by the absence of any mechanism like a peace production board for this purpose.

Techniques of taxation are far behind the times and the present tax bill does not deal with them. The administration recognizes this and promises to issue new depreciation schedules on equipment and machinery within the month which will help. But the whole problem of incentive in the tax system for those who work and produce has not yet been met or even effectively put before us.

I have this practical suggestion to make, if the President is looking for the confidence of business; and I applaud him for seeking it: A much more constructive purpose could be served now if the administration would announce abandonment of both impractical withholding provisions on dividends and interest and the discriminatory proposals for the taxation of U.S. private foreign investment, so that the tax bill, still in the Senate Finance Committee, could be cleared and passed. In this way the issues would be clarified for meaningful and immediate consideration of the thoroughgoing reform of our tax structure which the administration has promised to put before the Congress this year, and which is proposed to go into effect on January 1, 1963.

I am well aware of the opposition of the chairman of the committee to the 8-percent tax credit for equipment; but I believe there would be not nearly the need for that provision, although I agree with the proposal for it, and I would support it; but that, too, may have to be eliminated.

In combination with the revised depreciation schedules promised within a month, as Secretary Dillon has promised, the U.S. economic community could then plan for the future, instead of peering into a dark jungle of contradictory promises and hopes. A clear view ahead on taxes is needed—and this clear view must include an acceptable, major reform at the lowest and highest levels of taxation, not just a "quickie" tax cut which, in the absence of the other measures I have advocated, would be of little use except to further increase the deficit.

The very difficult balance-of-payments problem which concerns the whole economic world, awaits some resolution. Whatever the President may think about myths in budgets and national debt, many of those who can make or unmake our balance of payments and those with whom we compete intensively in the world market for exports have very different ideas. This does not mean that I do not agree with the President con-

cerning the relation of production to the national debt—for what is important is what we are worth with respect to what we owe—but I am talking about how we can be worth more. That is the new path; and I believe we should follow that path.

Productivity, not words, will answer the "myth," as the President puts it, about the national debt. Yet we see, at the very moment when our whole export trade must be stimulated, a completely contrary attitude on the part of the administration in pushing its tax bill which proposes to disadvantage American investment abroad through its tax treatment, even though such investment is closely tied to our trade and the hopes of improving our international balance of payments.

The President has asked for a "serious dialogue of a kind which has led in Europe to such fruitful collaboration among all elements of economic society and to a decade of unrivaled economic progress." I join him in this; but I also point out that leadership demands action and decisions and, above everything else, being able to lead in one's own house before one tries to lead the world.

The President has the means to accomplish the results he seeks. It is in the interest of every American that he succeed, and it is in this spirit that I speak today.

I want the President to succeed. The fact that he and I are members of different political parties is immaterial to me and to the rest of the country. This is not that kind of a debate. I want the President to succeed; and I offer these suggestions, based upon my work in the Senate and also upon a fair knowledge of the greatest financial market in the world—that in New York City. I regard the steps I have suggested as absolutely indispensable in order to assure the economic progress of the country.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to congratulate my colleague on his excellent address, and also for the specific recommendations he has made, the most important of which calls for an announcement by the administration that it is abandoning its tax program insofar as a withholding tax on dividends and interest is concerned. I also congratulate my colleague for proposing that the administration abandon what he very properly calls its discriminatory proposals for the taxation of U.S. investors abroad. I hope those in the administration who are concerned with these matters will give careful heed to the recommendations my colleague is making.

In his address at Yale, the President discussed three kinds of myths—those relating to the size and scope of government, to fiscal policy, and to what he termed "the matter of confidence." He sought to dispel what he called those "myths," in terms of the policies and the objectives of his administration.

However, in making his address at Yale, the President ignored a fourth

area. Despite overtures to private business, the President retains an apparent and quite obvious apprehension about the business community. Personally, I believe it is a myth to think that the interests of business and the interests of Government necessarily are opposed.

I agree with the President that public confidence is fundamental to a free economy. What we have observed in recent weeks—the stock market dip and the slowdown in our business growth rate—amount essentially to a crisis arising from a lack of confidence. The President is correct in stressing this point; but certainly he must do his share in building the necessary confidence.

At one point in his address at Yale University the President made an obvious reference to business leaders, when he said:

If a contest in angry argument were forced upon it, no administration could shrink from response, and history does not suggest that American Presidents are totally without resources in an engagement forced upon them because of hostility in one sector of society.

I wish that sentence had been omitted from the President's address.

I doubt very much that the business community is as hostile as the President implies. Private industry is basic to a free-enterprise system; and if businessmen were of the frame of mind he attributes to them, we would be in for rough sledding.

So I trust that his reference to "a contest in angry argument" does not reveal a hesitation on his part to really cooperate with industry. In a society whose lifeblood is friendly cooperation between labor, industry and Government, any failure of the administration to trust and respect one or another of these parties can throw up a real barrier to the building and maintaining of confidence in a free economy.

Mr. President, in the course of his address my colleague referred to tax revision as the No. 1 priority of the administration; but he also pointed out that this entire economic question is gradually becoming the overshadowing issue for the remainder of this session of Congress—as it is.

There was a time when Secretary Ribicoff talked about a "sleeper" issue for 1962; and I believe he was referring to the important proposed legislation relating to medical care. His choice of terms was an interesting one at the time; and right now it seems as if the "sleeper" issue—perhaps with a slight play on words—for 1962 will be the economy.

Our recovery has slowed down to a crawl. Unemployment remains dangerously high. In other respects the rebound from the 1960-61 recession has been the slowest of any of the four post-war recessions. So the "sleeper" issue may be, Why is everyone, labor and business included, so confused and uncertain about the economy? Why has there been such a complete failure in the efforts to build public confidence and to get America moving again?

I join with my distinguished colleague in the desire to make constructive suggestions. There is no gain for anyone, in any political party, or in any sector of our economy, in not getting America moving again, in not getting this sluggishness in the economy eliminated.

I believe my colleague has made several constructive suggestions today. I agree completely in the approach which he has made to this problem.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague. May I say, in response, that vindictiveness is not the way of American public life. I voted, in my time, against the Taft-Hartley Act and other measures which I thought were punitive and vindictive on labor. I believe the same way about vindictiveness toward management, or in any other segment of our economy. If anybody gets vindictive, the American people and the American form of government, including Congress, have ways to deal with it. I think we have a right to move forward on the assumption that vindictiveness will not be a part of the American scene.

I have said these things today—and I will be brief because I respect the time of the Senate and its desire to pass the bill today, if possible—when we are appropriating money in the area of \$48 billion. Where does it come from? It comes from the productivity of the economy that we are talking about. The Government produces nothing; the Government collects and does the things the people want done. This is an enormous block of production we are talking about. So it is very pertinent to decide what is the best policy to pursue in order to give us the best possibility of enjoying the fruits of that production for our own safety and defense.

In conclusion, I would like to make a part of my remarks the four questions which the President asked in his Yale speech, to which I am making my contribution in the way of an answer to those questions.

These questions are:

How can we develop and sustain strong and stable world markets for basic commodities without unfairness to the consumer and without undue stimulus to the producer?

How can we generate the buying power which can consume what we produce on our farms and in our factories?

How can we take advantage of the miracles of automation, with the great demand that it will put upon high-skilled labor and yet offer employment to the half a million of unskilled school dropouts every year who enter the labor market—8 million of them in the 1960's?

How do we eradicate the barriers which separate substantial minorities of our citizens from access to education and employment on equal terms with the rest?

I hope the President will consider it is not only a problem which is in the Executive, but one which is in the Congress, and will therefore pay strict attention to the observations and suggestions which are made here.

## MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal lately from the administration to the effect that the American people have been badly misled and misinformed with respect to the true intentions of the President's medicare proposal. In his recent address at Madison Square Garden, President Kennedy pleaded with the American people to seek the truth on this issue, presumably on the basis that once our citizens became aware of the facts as presented by the administration they would then support this measure without reservation.

Recently I received a letter from Bill Armstrong, managing director of radio station KOSI in Denver. True to the tradition of public service, KOSI took the President's challenge and ran a series of statements pro and con in order to stimulate public interest. The listeners were then invited to call the station and register an opinion on the proposal.

While I intend to include Bill Armstrong's letter in the RECORD, I would like to point out to the proponents of this legislation that out of a total of 6,397 telephone calls to the station, 5,516 individuals were against this measure.

It would appear to me that the administration has grossly underestimated the ability of the American people. I shall only add here that the proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., June 8, 1962.

HON. GORDON ALLOTT,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: As you know, KOSI has been extremely interested in the King-Anderson bill, which is now pending before Congress. We have felt that the public has not been very well advised as to the merits and drawbacks of this proposal, and, in an effort to stimulate public enthusiasm for the close scrutiny of the bill, we have set out to broadcast a series of statements, both pro and con, regarding the legislation, and asked our listeners to call us at KOSI public opinion poll headquarters where we set up a battery of telephone operators to receive calls from listeners expressing themselves either for or against the legislation.

It occurred to me that you will be interested in the results of the poll. During 4 days our operators (pledged to keep the tally honestly and accurately and supervised by station personnel) answered 6,397 phone calls and reported the following:

		Percent
For.....	881	13.7
Against.....	5,516	86.3
Total.....	6,397	100.0

We, of course, maintain an absolutely impartial position on the bill and attempted to present both sides of the case in the various statements which were broadcasted by speakers favoring and opposing the legislation. While we do not think that this public opinion sample is necessarily scientific nor projectable to the State of Colorado as a whole, we do believe that it has some meaning. Certainly the mere fact that so many people took the trouble to express themselves on the issue indicates the importance of it to the public.

We hope this information will be of interest and useful to you.

Respectfully submitted.

W. L. ARMSTRONG,  
Managing Director, KOSI.

## AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8031) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, there appears a very simple and very clear explanation for the need of this legislation in the committee report, which begins at page 2. I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the explanation which appears in the report beginning at page 2 and ending on page 5. My reason for doing this is to afford the Members of the Senate an opportunity to read this very short explanation, which I believe will be very helpful.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## NEED FOR LEGISLATION

One of the most valuable national resources which this country possesses is the radio spectrum. In carrying out its statutory mandate to provide the people of the United States with a truly nationwide and competitive broadcasting system, the FCC has allocated sufficient spectrum space to accommodate 2,225 television stations, which include 1,544 UHF stations and 681 VHF stations. But, chiefly because of the non-availability of television receivers which are capable of picking up UHF signals as well as VHF signals, the bulk of the UHF band is unused today, for at present there are only 103 UHF stations and 500 VHF stations in actual operation. This means that only 7 percent of the potential UHF assignments are in actual use, while the remaining 93 percent remain idle.

This legislation is designed to remedy this situation, for its basic purpose is to permit maximum efficient utilization of the broadcasting spectrum space, especially that portion of the spectrum assigned to UHF television. At the same time, this legislation will benefit the public interest in other substantial and important respects, for in addition to bringing new television service to underserved areas it will promote the development and growth of educational television.

At present the FCC has reserved 270 television channels for educational purposes, of which only 62 are in use. Of the total reserved for educational purposes, 92 are VHF and 187 are UHF. Only through the establishment of additional educational television broadcasting facilities and the activation of noncommercial educational television broadcasting stations can the goal of creating an educational television system serving the needs of all the people in the United States be accomplished.

Recently the Congress enacted legislation (Public Law 87-477, 87th Cong., 2d sess.) that provides for grants-in-aid for the acquisition and installation of television transmission apparatus for certain educational television broadcasting stations.

During the consideration of this educational television legislation, it became evident, as a result of a national study, that there was a maximum need for at least 97 VHF and 821 UHF channels which should

be added to the presently reserved channels to meet the needs of education in the years ahead. This means, in short, that the minimum needs of education projected from a grassroots level from school to school throughout the country will require at least 1,197 television channels for over-the-air broadcasting, in addition to closed circuit systems which might be used.

Therefore, it becomes obvious that this legislation calling for the manufacture of all-channel television receivers ties in significantly with the recently passed educational television legislation. For even in areas where there is extensive commercial VHF service, the all-channel television receiver legislation would help create the type of circulation which will permit the development of the educational television broadcasting stations that use UHF channels.

This goal would be achieved by eliminating the basic problem which lies at the heart of the UHF-VHF dilemma—the relative scarcity of television receivers in the United States which are capable of receiving the signals of UHF stations. Of the approximately 55 million television receivers presently in the hands of the public, only 9 million (or about 16 percent) can receive UHF signals. This scarcity of all-channel receivers is further aggravated by the fact that the overwhelming bulk of television set production is limited to VHF sets only. Moreover, since 1953, the situation has become progressively worse. In that year, over 20 percent of television receivers were equipped at the time of manufacture to receive UHF; by 1961, that percentage had declined to 6 percent.

The practical effect of this scarcity of all-channel receivers is clear: It prevents effective competition between UHF and VHF stations which operate in the same market, thus relegating UHF to those areas where no VHF stations are in competition. Where the two types of stations operate together, advertisers show a marked preference for placing their programs on VHF outlets, as do also networks, who will affiliate with a VHF station wherever possible. Nor has the viewing public shown any substantial willingness to buy receivers capable of receiving UHF signals, except in those areas where no VHF programs are available.

At the present time the country is divided into 278 so-called television markets: 127 of these markets have only 1 television station, 70 are 2-station markets, 57 are 3-station markets, and 24 are markets with 4 or more stations. Consequently, under the television market term, almost three-fourths of the television markets have a choice of one or two local stations. The significance of these figures illustrate that our present system of competition in the television field is limited by the allocations structure to no more than three national networks. Moreover, even in terms of the present 3 networks, 1 of them is under a limited handicapped because of the second figure (70 markets are limited to 2 stations) and this leads to a situation that makes it difficult for a third network to secure primary affiliates in those markets. In addition, the opportunity for local outlets which would be available for local programming and local self-expression is severely restricted in many of the markets because of the limited number of stations that are available and even in those areas where there are some available, the stations are network affiliates.

Over the years, this problem has been exhaustively considered by your committee, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Federal Communications Commission. Since 1953, numerous hearings have been held on this subject, and both Congress and the Commission have explored various alternative solutions for the UHF problem. One of these proposed solutions—the possibility of obtaining from the

Department of Defense additional frequencies for use in the VHF and lower UHF portions of the lower portions of the radio spectrum—turned out to be impracticable because of the disruption which would have been caused to Government radio services operating on the frequencies proposed to be reassigned.

Another proposed solution contemplated a 70-channel UHF-only television system. But the FCC rejected this proposal on the grounds that it would cause a tremendous and unwarranted dislocation of services, and further, that there is a definite need for utilizing both UHF and VHF television channels. There is thus a vicious cycle; refusal by the public to buy UHF sets until there are UHF stations offering attractive programs, and the inability of UHF broadcasters to provide good programming in the absence of an audience which will attract advertisers and networks. The net result: Very few UHF stations have dared to go on the air; of those that have, 100 had to give up and are now dark.

In light of these considerations, your committee was impressed by the following judgments reached by the FCC:

First, that it is necessary to break this vicious cycle that has been strangling UHF television.

Second, that this must be done by striking at the root cause of the problem—namely, the lack of television receivers capable of receiving UHF signals.

And, finally, that the only practical and effective means of insuring that such receivers get into the hands of the public is to enact legislation requiring that all sets manufactured are capable of receiving all of the channels allocated for television use in both the UHF and VHF portions of the spectrum.

We have fully considered the various arguments which have been advanced against this legislation. It has been argued that it would be a dangerous precedent which might lead to congressional control of all types of manufactured products. It must be remembered that this involves a unique situation which would not in any way constitute a general precedent for such congressional regulation of manufactured products. Thus we are here concerned with an instrumentality of interstate commerce. Television receivers are an essential factor in the use of the spectrum, and, as such, are clearly within the ambit of congressional legislation.

While initially there will be an increased cost, it is expected that this will be substantially reduced once the benefits of mass production are fully realized. In any event, the relatively slight increase in cost will be a small price to pay for the unlocking of the 70 valuable UHF channels.

## MEDICAL AND HEALTH CARE UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Bloomington Pantagraph is at once one of the most influential and most conservative newspapers in central Illinois. It is therefore extremely significant that it should have published a strong and lucid editorial supporting medical and health care for the aged under the social security system.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which appeared in the Pantagraph for May 8, 1962, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SOCIAL SECURITY BEST MEDICAL CARE PLAN

After thorough study of the alternatives we believe the social security approach to medical care for the aged is the most reasonable yet proposed.

It offers the only effective opportunity for prepaying of medical and hospital costs by the greatest number of people.

It is the only plan which does not involve the appropriation of Federal funds for its financing for those unable to buy private plans.

It is clear that the administration and the American Medical Association, the principal opponent to the social security approach, cannot compromise on the key issue in any medical plan—how to pay for it.

We do not say that the program now envisioned by the administration is the best one which could be devised under social security. The provisions fall far short of adequate protection.

The argument that medical care for the aged under social security would be socialistic cannot stand the real test of logic.

The Federal-aid program under the Kerr-Mills legislation is outright socialism in that the recipient pays nothing toward it. On the State and Federal level it is a drag on general revenues.

Some States have shifted all the burden to the Federal Government by reducing regular matching appropriations for aid programs by the amount of the Kerr-Mills grant.

Most plans put forward call for the use of Federal funds.

The American Hospital Association, for example, has suggested Federal grants-in-aid to assist low-income families in paying the cost of Blue Cross premiums. Even the plan for tax deduction credit (the Bow plan) involves Government aid.

We feel that Representatives and Senators who cry socialism in opposition to the extension of social security to medical care had best look to their own generous pensions and to the virtually free medical and hospital attention they receive from the Government.

Congress seems to worry less and less about spending—if it benefits its own membership.

Many insiders in Washington predict that a social security-oriented medical plan will be adopted by the Congress. There is every reason to believe that grassroots sentiment is growing in favor of such a program.

We do not have the answer to those who fear medical care for the aged under social security is only the first step to universal medical care on the British plan.

That battle can be fought when it arises. But the fact remains that fewer than half our citizens over 65 have health insurance and still fewer have adequate protection.

With the high risk involved, private plans are out of the reach of many. Many, however, will not abandon private plans if social security medical care is adopted. Insured private retirement plans have not suffered because of social security.

The Kerr-Mills legislation, adopted year, is a Federal matching program similar to those under which States operate old-age assistance and aid to dependent children programs.

Illinois appropriated \$9 million; Federal funds in a similar amount are available. But only 24 States passed enabling legislation to take advantage of the plan. They didn't have the money. It is an awkward program and a humiliating one. To get aid recipients must be classed as "medically indigent."

In the large view, this country cannot afford to let the aged ill suffer when the free enterprise system has the genius and the capability of providing well for all our citizens.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the previous order, at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.